

Date: Wed, 3 Aug 94 17:09:31 PDT
From: Info-Hams Mailing List and Newsgroup <info-hams@ucsd.edu>
Errors-To: Info-Hams-Errors@UCSD.Edu
Reply-To: Info-Hams@UCSD.Edu
Precedence: Bulk
Subject: Info-Hams Digest V94 #872
To: Info-Hams

Info-Hams Digest Wed, 3 Aug 94 Volume 94 : Issue 872

Today's Topics:

.52 beacon legal? (was: Amateur Radio Newsline #885 31 Jul 94)
Amateur radio clubs in the Brenham, Texas area?
Car warrantee and 2m radio (4 msgs)
Daily Summary of Solar Geophysical Activity for 31 July
Ham Software Pirates?
ICOM 3230 800mhz mod?
Info on linking repeaters?
Mobile Radio in Dodge Caravan?
Question from a NOVICE (2 msgs)

Send Replies or notes for publication to: <Info-Hams@UCSD.Edu>
Send subscription requests to: <Info-Hams-REQUEST@UCSD.Edu>
Problems you can't solve otherwise to brian@ucsd.edu.

Archives of past issues of the Info-Hams Digest are available (by FTP only) from UCSD.Edu in directory "mailarchives/info-hams".

We trust that readers are intelligent enough to realize that all text herein consists of personal comments and does not represent the official policies or positions of any party. Your mileage may vary. So there.

Date: Wed, 3 Aug 94 10:14:20 -0500
From: news.delphi.com!usenet@uunet.uu.net
Subject: .52 beacon legal? (was: Amateur Radio Newsline #885 31 Jul 94)
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

David R Tucker <drt@world.std.com> writes:

>I was under the impression that automatically controlled beacons on 2
>meters were restricted to 144.275-144.300 (97.203d). How, then, can
>this be legal? And anyway, does continuous MCW on the National
>Simplex Frequency, even locally, qualify as good practice?

Here Here!

I found this very disturbing as well, and i thought that it showed baltant disregard for the band plan. 146.52 is a major simplex thorofare here in CT and a beacon would be bombed in short order. It took a load of griping for me to get the local foxhunters (whom i now "represent") to get off .52.

Any op's confirm the existence of this thing???

73 de n1qdq

Date: 3 Aug 1994 13:54:27 GMT
From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!dog.ee.lbl.gov!overload.lbl.gov!agate!howland.reston.ans.net!
swrinde!news.uh.edu!usenet@network.ucsd.edu
Subject: Amateur radio clubs in the Brenham, Texas area?
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

Subject says it all, pretty much. I am in process of getting Technician+, and could use some help/advice setting up shack/antenna system, etc. Although I commute to Houston everyday, I would rather get help from a little closer to home. (FWIW I actually live closer to College Station/Bryan than to Houston.)

Thanks.

Date: 3 Aug 1994 14:15:36 GMT
From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!agate!cat.cis.Brown.EDU!pstc3!md@network.ucsd.edu
Subject: Car warranty and 2m radio
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

In article <31m6iv\$f94@news.bu.edu>, David Gagnon wrote:

|> I am in the process of looking for a new car and someone brought up the
|> possibility that installing a 2m rig might void a new car warrantee. His
|> thought was that the radio might do damage to the cars computer and that
|> having the radio might invalidate a provision of the warrantee.

Every time I hear about this I have to chuckle, as if these car manufacturers think that outside RF somehow stops at the boundary of

their vehicle.

If the computer is so prone to damage from large RF fields and installing a radio in your car may cause damage, according to the manufacturer, tell the manufacturer that you're not going to purchase the car. Tell them "gee, I wouldn't want to have my computer fried by some CB radio operator in the car next to me running an illegal 1000 watt amplifier." See how quick they change their story...

MD

--
-- The best way for Bill Clinton to keep his
-- legal fees down is to keep his zipper up.
--

Date: 3 Aug 94 10:27:42

From: agate!howland.reston.ans.net!usc!nic-nac.CSU.net!charnel.ecst.csuchico.edu!
yeshua.marcam.com!zip.eecs.umich.edu!newsxfer.itd.umich.edu!news1.oakland.edu!
rcsuna.gmr.com!@ihnp4.ucsd.edu
Subject: Car warrantee and 2m radio
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

In article <31m6iv\$f94@news.bu.edu> david@bu.edu (David Gagnon) writes:

I am in the process of looking for a new car and someone brought up the possibility that installing a 2m rig might void a new car warrantee. His thought was that the radio might do damage to the cars computer and that having the radio might invalidate a provision of the warrantee.

It's not a problem with GM products. They even publish a nice pamphlet describing how you ought to go about installing the radio for least interference. GM has provided vehicles for mobile communications activities for as long as I can remember and doesn't want to loose that business.

Send me a SASE and I'll send you a copy.
Val Breault
8101 Warren Blvd.
Center Line, MI 48015

I recently acquired an Icom IC-28h that puts out 45 watts at high power.

Nice rig. I think I've fallen in love with mine. :-)

BTW I'm looking at the 94 Accord, Mazda 626, Mitsubishi Gallant, Taurus,

Subaru Legacy, and Camry.

Ask your salesperson for hard proof that the installation will be okay. I've heard that installing a mobile radio voids the warranty on some manufacturers vehicles.

I have a hard time believing that it'll be a problem, but this is the place to ask. Please respond directly via e-mail. Thanks.

Okay. The rest of you folks please pretend you didn't read this. :-)

>David<

Val Breault - N80EF - vbreault@gmr.com \ /
Instrumentation dept GM NAO R&D Center \ / |
My opinions are not necessarily those of \ /__|
GMR nor of the General Motors Corporation \ |

Date: 3 Aug 1994 09:43:56 -0400
From: news1.digex.net!digex.net!not-for-mail@uunet.uu.net
Subject: Car warranty and 2m radio
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

In article <31m6iv\$f94@news.bu.edu>, David Gagnon wrote:
>
> I am in the process of looking for a new car and someone brought up the
> possibility that installing a 2m rig might void a new car warrantee. His
> thought was that the radio might do damage to the cars computer and that
> having the radio might invalidate a provision of the warrantee.
>
> I recently acquired an Icom IC-28h that puts out 45 watts at high power.
> I notice interference in my car radio when transmitting at high power, so
> there is some leakage going on. Do I have anything to worry about?
>
> I guess there are two questions here: "Is there a chance of causing damage?"
> and "Am I in trouble just by putting it in the car?"
>
> BTW I'm looking at the 94 Accord, Mazda 626, Mitsubishi Gallant, Taurus,
> Subaru Legacy, and Camry.
>

> I have a hard time believing that it'll be a problem, but this is the place
> to ask. Please respond directly via e-mail. Thanks.
>
> >David<
> --
> David R. Gagnon, MD MPH > david@med-buspheb.bu.edu
> Boston University School of Public Health > (617) 638-4457 [voice]
> Boston, Massachusetts > (617) 638-4458 [fax]
> "ecrasez l'infamie"

See if they'll let you test drive the vehicle over the weekend. Put all the gear you're going to use into the vehicle, put up mag mount or trunk mount antennas, and QSO-away at full power driving around your neighborhood. If the vehicle dies, catch a ride home, pull out the gear, call the dealer and tell him they've got a DOA vehicle to pick up! Just a sly suggestion, a friend did this before he picked up his Bronco II and it worked fine, so he finalized the deal.

Andy

Date: Wed, 3 Aug 1994 03:43:24 GMT
From: netcomsv!netcom.com!benacp@decwrl.dec.com
Subject: Car warrantee and 2m radio
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

David,

I not only had my 2m rig in the car but I have 155Mhz radio in my car scanner under the dash and Green Light on my roof (Volunteer Paramedic). None of these devices voided my warantee or ruined my cars computer. Yours cars computer get more sh*t from that engine then it ever will from your 2m rig.

So relax and enjoy your car and your hobby.

Pete, N2BLY

David Gagnon (david@bu.edu) wrote:

: I am in the process of looking for a new car and someone brought up the
: possibility that installing a 2m rig might void a new car warrantee. His
: thought was that the radio might do damage to the cars computer and that
: having the radio might invalidate a provision of the warrantee.

: I recently acquired an Icom IC-28h that puts out 45 watts at high power.
: I notice interference in my car radio when transmitting at high power, so

: there is some leakage going on. Do I have anything to worry about?
:
: I guess there are two questions here: "Is there a chance of causing damage?"
:
: and "Am I in trouble just by putting it in the car?"
:
: BTW I'm looking at the 94 Accord, Mazda 626, Mitsubishi Gallant, Taurus,
:
: Subaru Legacy, and Camry.
:
: I have a hard time believing that it'll be a problem, but this is the place
:
: to ask. Please respond directly via e-mail. Thanks.

: >David<
:
: --
: David R. Gagnon, MD MPH david@med-busphb.bu.edu
: Boston University School of Public Health (617) 638-4457 [voice]
: Boston, Massachusetts (617) 638-4458 [fax]
:
: "ecrasez l'infamie"

Peter P. Benac
North Winds Systems, Inc

Specializing in Custom Data Communications Solutions for DOS and Unix
Voice: 1-315-598-9212
Compuserve: 74151,2703
Internet: benacp@netcom.com

Date: Tue, 2 Aug 1994 20:03:50 MDT
From: agate!howland.reston.ans.net!europa.eng.gtefsd.com!library.ucla.edu!
news.mic.ucla.edu!unixg.ubc.ca!quartz.ucs.ualberta.ca!alberta!ve6mgs!
usenet@ames.arpa
Subject: Daily Summary of Solar Geophysical Activity for 31 July
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

DAILY SUMMARY OF SOLAR GEOPHYSICAL ACTIVITY

31 JULY, 1994

(Based In-Part On SESC Observational Data)

SOLAR AND GEOPHYSICAL ACTIVITY INDICES FOR 31 JULY, 1994

!!BEGIN!! (1.0) S.T.D. Solar Geophysical Data Broadcast for DAY 212, 07/31/94
10.7 FLUX=075 90-AVG=079 SSN=014 BKI=2213 2213 BAI=007
BGND-XRAY=A1.4 FLU1=5.5E+05 FLU10=1.3E+04 PKI=3213 2223 PAI=008
BOU-DEV=017,014,006,***,***,***,***,*** DEV-AVG=012 NT SWF=00:000
XRAY-MAX= A5.1 @ 1102UT XRAY-MIN= A1.2 @ 0104UT XRAY-AVG= A2.1
NEUTN-MAX= +001% @ 0530UT NEUTN-MIN= -003% @ 0710UT NEUTN-AVG= -0.9%
PCA-MAX= +0.1DB @ 0900UT PCA-MIN= -0.1DB @ 0245UT PCA-AVG= -0.0DB
BOUTF-MAX=55245NT @ 0444UT BOUTF-MIN=55235NT @ 0137UT BOUTF-AVG=55240NT
GOES7-MAX=P:+000NT@ 0000UT GOES7-MIN=N:+000NT@ 0000UT G7-AVG=+058,+000,+000
GOES6-MAX=P:+120NT@ 0006UT GOES6-MIN=N:-034NT@ 0058UT G6-AVG=+089,+022,-010
FLUXFCST=STD:075,075,077;SESC:075,075,077 BAI/PAI-FCST=005,005,010/008,008,010
KFCST=2223 3221 1223 3221 27DAY-AP=011,007 27DAY-KP=3332 2333 2221 2323
WARNINGS=
ALERTS=**SWEEP:II=2@1029-1044UTC(1500KM/SEC)
!!END-DATA!!

NOTE: The Effective Sunspot Number for 30 JUL 94 was 27.9.
The Full Kp Indices for 30 JUL 94 are: 3+ 3- 2o 2- 2- 2o 2+ 3-
The 3-Hr Ap Indices for 30 JUL 94 are: 20 12 8 6 6 8 10 12
Greater than 2 MeV Electron Fluence for 31 JUL is: 2.7E+07

SYNOPSIS OF ACTIVITY

Solar activity was very low. A Type II sweep was reported by the Sagamore Hill and San Vito observatories at 31/1029Z. Shock velocity was estimated at 1500 km/sec. No x-ray or optical correlation was indicated with this sweep.

Solar activity forecast: solar activity is expected to be very low.

The geomagnetic field has been at mostly quiet to unsettled levels for the past 24 hours. The GT 2 MeV energetic electron flux was mostly normal to moderate. A brief period of high flux readings was recorded early in the period from 30/2100Z to 30/2400Z.

Geophysical activity forecast: the geomagnetic field is expected to be mostly quiet to unsettled for the next three days.

Event probabilities 01 aug-03 aug

Class M	01/01/01
Class X	01/01/01

Proton 01/01/01
PCAF Green

Geomagnetic activity probabilities 01 aug-03 aug

A. Middle Latitudes
Active 10/10/20
Minor Storm 05/05/05
Major-Severe Storm 01/01/01

B. High Latitudes
Active 10/10/25
Minor Storm 05/05/05
Major-Severe Storm 01/01/05

HF propagation conditions were normal over all regions.
No changes are expected over the next 2 to 3 days, although
there is a slight chance high latitudes may begin to see minor
signal degradation on 03 or 04 August in response to recurrent
geomagnetic activity.

COPIES OF JOINT USAF/NOAA SESC SOLAR GEOPHYSICAL REPORTS

REGIONS WITH SUNSPOTS. LOCATIONS VALID AT 31/2400Z JULY

NMBR LOCATION LO AREA Z LL NN MAG TYPE
7760 S07W63 271 0020 BX0 03 004 BETA
7759 N03W03 211 PLAGE

REGIONS DUE TO RETURN 01 AUGUST TO 03 AUGUST

NMBR LAT LO
7754 N12 080

LISTING OF SOLAR ENERGETIC EVENTS FOR 31 JULY, 1994

BEGIN MAX END RGN LOC XRAY OP 245MHZ 10CM SWEEP
1029 1044 II

POSSIBLE CORONAL MASS EJECTION EVENTS FOR 31 JULY, 1994

BEGIN MAX END LOCATION TYPE SIZE DUR II IV
31/ 1029 1044 RSP 2

INFERRRED CORONAL HOLES. LOCATIONS VALID AT 31/2400Z

ISOLATED HOLES AND POLAR EXTENSIONS
EAST SOUTH WEST NORTH CAR TYPE POL AREA OBSN
NO DATA AVAILABLE FOR ANALYSIS

SUMMARY OF FLARE EVENTS FOR THE PREVIOUS UTC DAY

Date Begin Max End Xray Op Region Locn 2695 MHz 8800 MHz 15.4 GHz

NO EVENTS OBSERVED.

REGION FLARE STATISTICS FOR THE PREVIOUS UTC DAY

C M X S 1 2 3 4 Total (%)
-- -- -- -- -- -- -- -- -- --
Uncorrellated: 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 000 (0.0)

Total Events: 000 optical and x-ray.

EVENTS WITH SWEEPS AND/OR OPTICAL PHENOMENA FOR THE LAST UTC DAY

Date Begin Max End Xray Op Region Locn Sweeps/Optical Observations

NO EVENTS OBSERVED.

NOTES:

All times are in Universal Time (UT). Characters preceding begin, max, and end times are defined as: B = Before, U = Uncertain, A = After. All times associated with x-ray flares (ex. flares which produce associated x-ray bursts) refer to the begin, max, and end times of the x-rays. Flares which are not associated with x-ray signatures use the optical observations to determine the begin, max, and end times.

Acronyms used to identify sweeps and optical phenomena include:

II = Type II Sweep Frequency Event
III = Type III Sweep
IV = Type IV Sweep
V = Type V Sweep
Continuum = Continuum Radio Event
Loop = Loop Prominence System,
Spray = Limb Spray,

Surge = Bright Limb Surge,
EPL = Eruptive Prominence on the Limb.

** End of Daily Report **

Date: Wed, 3 Aug 1994 12:10:10 GMT
From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!agate!howland.reston.ans.net!gatech!wa4mei!ke4zv!
gary@network.ucsd.edu
Subject: Ham Software Pirates?
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

In article <Ctwy08.5yF@csn.org> lwjames@csn.org (Dr. Lawrence James) writes:
>
>In August '94 QST, Brian Beezley, K6STI, is quoted as saying "Many
>software developers have no defense against the widespread software
>piracy that occurs in the Amateur Radio market."
>
>Without implicating any specific person, is this valid? Are hams really
>any worse than the rest of the population?

I think it's fair to say that hams **are** more experimentally inclined than the general population, most of the general population are still staring at the 12:00 flashing on their VCRs. However, I don't think hams are much different from the average technoid computer user. Many hams are hackers (in the original good meaning of the term). They are going to want either source code, or they're going to disassemble the binary to see how it works. And they are likely to want to tinker with the code. Then they'll want to share that knowledge with their fellows.

Because of the experimental nature of amateur radio, I prefer not to use commercial software for my amateur activities. That's why when the Netrom-theNet controversy boiled up I went another way, using the KA9Q code as switch code. Yeah, it meant a PC on the mountain, but it gave me more flexibility to experiment. And that's what it's all about for me.

When I do buy commercial software, I avoid software with copy protection or restrictive licensing. I'll pay a book price for useful software whose author treats it like a book in his license agreement. I won't pay exorbitant prices for buggy software with no support and lock and key licensing. It seems that most software marketed in the latter way has fallen by the wayside because others feel the same way I do. When most software authors complain about piracy, it's usually just imaginary sales that they are trying to

tally. The ones screaming piracy the loudest probably have software priced such that they aren't going to get many legitimate sales anyway. Those with more realistic pricing don't seem to have as much complaint about piracy, and their sales are larger too.

Gary

--

Gary Coffman KE4ZV		You make it,		gatech!wa4mei!ke4zv!gary
Destructive Testing Systems		we break it.		uunet!rsiatl!ke4zv!gary
534 Shannon Way		Guaranteed!		emory!kd4nc!ke4zv!gary
Lawrenceville, GA 30244				

Date: 3 Aug 1994 14:54:27 GMT
From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!agate!howland.reston.ans.net!europa.eng.gtefsd.com!ceylon!
NewsWatcher!user@network.ucsd.edu
Subject: ICOM 3230 800mhz mod?
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

Fellow Amateurs,

Does anyone have any information on the mods for the ICOM 3230 dualband transciever? I found some for the 2410 sister unit, but it doesn't appear to be the same. I'd be interested in any comments from mod advice to performance comments. Please Email comments to ==> dginsberg@gte.com

73,
Don

Date: 3 Aug 1994 00:23:29 -0500
From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!agate!howland.reston.ans.net!gatech!newsxfer.itd.umich.edu!
zip.eecs.umich.edu!yeshua.marcam.com!insosf1.infonet.net!worf.infonet.net!not-for-
mail@network.ucsd.edu
Subject: Info on linking repeaters?
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

Hello,

I'm interested in obtaining some information on linking repeaters. Such as simply linking up 2 machines, all the way up to wide area repeater networks that I hear about out west.

Send any replies to cjvan@worf.infonet.net. Thanks.

73,
Chris - N0WHI
m

Date: 3 Aug 1994 15:50:15 GMT
From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!agate!howland.reston.ans.net!europa.eng.gtefsd.com!
news.umbc.edu!haven.umd.edu!cs.umd.edu!newsfeed.gsfc.nasa.gov!lvn@network.ucsd.edu
Subject: Mobile Radio in Dodge Caravan?
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

I'm about to install my 2 meter mobile in my Dodge Caravan and would like to hear what others have done. Offhand, no outstanding location for mounting it is leaping out at me.

Thanks,
Larry, K3TLX

Date: 3 Aug 1994 14:25:41 GMT
From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!agate!howland.reston.ans.net!math.ohio-state.edu!
hobbes.physics.uiowa.edu!newsrelay.iastate.edu!news.iastate.edu!
isuvax.iastate.edu!TWP77@network.ucsd.edu
Subject: Question from a NOVICE
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

In article <17210026@hpwrce.mayfield.hp.com>, lou@hpwrce.mayfield.hp.com (Lou Duncan) writes:
Yes, there is a "Technician Plus" license now. The FCC just started issuing to Technicians who passed the 5wpm code test. Even before it was a separate license, Technicians who passed the code test could operate on all the HF Novice bands.

So, yes, the code test will make a difference. It will give you HF privileges that Technicians who have not passed the code test will have.

Date: Wed, 3 Aug 1994 14:08:05 GMT
From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!agate!howland.reston.ans.net!swrinde!gatech!news-feed-1.peachnet.edu!darwin.sura.net!wa4mei!ke4zv!gary@network.ucsd.edu
Subject: Question from a NOVICE
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

In article <17210026@hpwrce.mayfield.hp.com> lou@hpwrce.mayfield.hp.com (Lou Duncan) writes:

>Howdy,
>I've had a Novice license since the mid 80's and have recently started to
>think about getting a Technician Class License.
>
>I notice that there is now a NO-CODE Tech. License....is there an advantage
>to me having passed the 5 wpm test?

Yes, it qualifies you for the Tech Plus license which has limited HF
privileges, including voice on a segment of 10 meters and all of your
current Novice CW segments.

>I always thought the code test kept HAM from becoming like CB (I've
>really been out of touch so if this is a sore issue, please give me some slack)

It's a very sore issue, off to policy with you. :-)

>Obviously, I have no room to make any comments...all I want know is there a
>separate license for Technician with code?

The FCC initially said that there wouldn't be a separate license for
Tech with code, just keep your proof you passed a 5 WPM exam forever
and go ahead and use the HF slivers. Now, however, it's reported that
the new computer system at the FCC is allowing them to print Tech Plus
on licenses of those with proof of passing a 5 WPM exam. If you haven't
passed a 5 WPM exam, you're limited to the frequencies above 30 MHz and
don't get the Plus printed on your Tech license.

Gary

--
Gary Coffman KE4ZV | You make it, | gatech!wa4mei!ke4zv!gary
Destructive Testing Systems | we break it. | uunet!rsiatl!ke4zv!gary
534 Shannon Way | Guaranteed! | emory!kd4nc!ke4zv!gary
Lawrenceville, GA 30244 |

Date: 2 Aug 1994 18:36:14 -0700
From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!usc!elroy.jpl.nasa.gov!lll-winken.llnl.gov!apple.com!
apple.com!not-for-mail@network.ucsd.edu
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

References <CtKs4o.5or@news.Hawaii.Edu>, <gregCtpuwo.F3y@netcom.com>,
<31c699\$7sv@chnews.intel.com>.
Subject : Re: Ramsey SlyFox

Cecil_A_Moore@ccm.hf.intel.com writes:

>In article <gregCtpuwo.F3y@netcom.com>, Greg Bullough <greg@netcom.com> wrote:

>>>In article <h0+RTqi.jramsey@delphi.com> jramsey@delphi.com writes:

>>>it's easier to spread the coils a bit than to have to add more turns!

>>Gee, Cecil, it's a good thing that kit manufacturers can expect not to
>>have to re-teach hams the 'basic physics' that they had to know to get
>>their ham licenses, isn't it? Greg

>Hi again Greg, Obviously, John functions on an algebraic plane so he
>no doubt meant to say, "add more (negative) turns". ;-)

Oh boy. It is arguable if Ramsey deserves some of the flames hurled
at him. He definitely does not deserve this one!

Look, I interpret what John Ramsey wrote as: Ramsey purposely made the
coils a little larger than necessary, so that simpletons could tune
the stuff they had built with very little trouble. Had he made the
coils a little smaller, the purchaser would have had to add more turns,
which is much more difficult to do, to achieve equivalent ability
to tune. Thus

>> it's easier to spread the coils a bit than to have to add more turns!

If you find John's explanation so hard to understand, how did you
blokes understand Icom manuals, anyway? :-)

73,

Kok Chen, AA6TY kchen@apple.com
Apple Computer, Inc.

End of Info-Hams Digest V94 #872
